

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, 1917.

No. 567.

THE UNITED STATES, PLAINTIFF IN ERROR,


vs.

FRED W. WEITZEL.

IN ERROR TO THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR
THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY.

FILED JULY 11, 1918.

(26034)



SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, 1917.

No. 567.

THE UNITED STATES, PLAINTIFF IN ERROR,

vs.

FRED W. WEITZEL.

IN ERROR TO THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR
THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY.

INDEX.

	Original. Print.	
Caption.....	1	1
Arraignment and plea.....	2	1
Order as to bond.....	2	1
Order to docket case and as to bond.....	2	1
Clerk's certificate to orders.....	3	2
Indictment in No. 1384.....	4	2
General demurrer in No. 1384.....	45	23
Orders continuing case, etc., 1384.....	47	24
Indictment in No. 1386.....	48	25
General demurrer in No. 1386.....	53	27
Order consolidating cases and filing demurrer.....	53	27
Orders continuing case, etc.....	54	28
Indictment in No. 138.....	56	29
General demurrer in No. 1387.....	63	33
Order filing demurrer and consolidating cases.....	63	33
Opinion, Cochran, J.....	64	33
Judgment.....	65	34
Petition for writ of error.....	66	35
Assignment of errors.....	67	35
Order allowing writ of error.....	68	36
Recipe for record.....	69	36
Writ of error.....	70	36
Clerk's certificate.....	72	37
Citation and service.....	73	38

THE HISTORY OF THE

REIGN OF

CHARLES THE FIRST

BY SAMUEL JOHNSON

IN THREE VOLUMES

LONDON

1794

Printed by J. JOHNSON

St. Pauls Church-yard

near St. Dunstons

in the Strand

and sold by

all the Booksellers

in Great Britain

and Ireland

and the Colonies

and Foreign Parts

and the West Indies

and the Cape of Good Hope

and the East Indies

and the South Sea Islands

and the North America

and the West India Islands

and the Cape of Good Hope

and the East Indies

and the South Sea Islands

and the North America

and the West India Islands

1

Transcript of orders.

Filed May 16, 1917.

Proceedings had in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, at a regular term of court begun and held in the city of Covington, in the Federal Court Hall, on Monday, April 2nd, A. D. 1917, and of our Independence the 141st year.

Court met. Present: Hon. A. M. J. Cochran, judge; J. W. Menzies, U. S. clerk; Thos. D. Slattery, U. S. attorney; R. C. Ford, U. S. marshal.

UNITED STATES, PLAINTIFF,	} 3794.
v.	
FRED W. WEITZEL, DEFENDANT.	

Be it remembered, that heretofore, to wit on the 17th day of October, A. D. 1916, an order was made and entered herein, being in words and figures as follows:

UNITED STATES	} 3794.
vs.	
FRED W. WEITZEL.	

A true bill.

TAYLOR ASBURY, *Foreman.*

2 And on the same day, to-wit, the 17th day of October, A. D. 1916, the following order was made and entered herein:

Order.

This day came the U. S. attorney and the defendant came to the bar of the court in discharge of the requirement of his bond, and having been formally arraigned, it was thereupon demanded of him, the said Fred W. Weitzel, of and concerning the charges against him alleged in the indictment herein, and he pleads that he is not guilty as charged therein.

Whereupon came the U. S. attorney and on his motion, the court being advised, it is ordered that this cause be and the same is continued until the next regular term of court. It is further ordered that the bond of the defendant be and the same is fixed at the sum of \$3,000.00, with good and sufficient surety.

Order.

Entered April 2, 1917.

This cause coming on to be heard came the U. S. attorney and upon his motion, the court being advised, it is ordered that this cause be and same is continued and transferred to Catlettsburg for trial on

June 11, 1917. And the clerk of the court is directed to transmit to Catlettsburg the papers herein, together with the transcript of the orders that the case may be properly docketed.

3 It is further ordered that the defendant, F. W. Weitzel, execute bond in the sum of three thousand dollars (\$3,000.00) for his appearance at said time and place.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Eastern District of Kentucky, ss:

I, J. W. Menzies, clerk of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, at Covington, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of all orders herein in the matter set out in the caption hereto, as the same appears from the records and files of this office.

Witness my hand as clerk and the seal of said court at Covington, Kentucky, this 15th day of May, A. D. 1917, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 141st year.

[SEAL.]

J. W. MENZIES, *Clerk.*

By O. M. MITCHEL, *D. C.*

4

Indictment.

Ret. and filed at Covington October 17, 1916; filed at Catlettsburg May 16, 1917.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Eastern District of Kentucky, ss:

In the District Court of the United States of America in and for the Eastern District of Kentucky, held at Covington, Kentucky, at the October term, in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and sixteen.

The grand jurors of the United States of America, impaneled, sworn, and charged to inquire for the body of the said Eastern District of Kentucky, at the term aforesaid, and inquiring for that district, upon their oath present:

That on the 13th day of August, A. D. 1914, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books,

records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency.

5 That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did, on the 13th day of August, A. D. 1914, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment, and while he was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and taken into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of three thousand (\$3,000.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last-mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing, and therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of three thousand (\$3,000.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of three thousand (\$3,000.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use.

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

6

Second count.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 2nd day of December, A. D. 1914, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the

United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency, and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did on the 2nd day of December, A. D. 1914, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment, and while he was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent

7 of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of fifty-eight and 50/100 (\$58.50) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing and, therefore, can not here set forth), the said sum of fifty-eight and 50/100 (\$58.50) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of fifty-eight and 50/100 (\$58.50) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did, then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds, and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

8

Third count.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 12th day of December, A. D. 1914, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders

theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency, and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did on the 12th day of December, A. D. 1914, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment and while he was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of seventy-five (\$75.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing and therefore cannot here set forth), the said sum of seventy-five (\$75.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of seventy-five (\$75.00) he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did then and there wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

10

Fourth count.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 25th day of January, A. D. 1915, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to

proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency, and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did on the 25th day of January, A. D. 1915, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment
11 and while he was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of two hundred (\$200.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grant jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing, and, therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of two hundred (\$200.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of two hundred (\$200.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did, then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

12

Fifth count.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 6th day of April, A. D. 1915, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; and said national

banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did on the 6th day of April, A. D. 1915, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment and

13 while he was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of fifteen (\$15.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing, and, therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of fifteen (\$15.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of fifteen (\$15.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did, then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

14

Sixth count.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 15th day of July, A. D. 1915, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in

the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation, and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did on the 15th day of July, A. D. 1915, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment, and
15 while he was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of said national banking association as aforesaid, have receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of one hundred and twenty (\$120.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last-mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing, and, therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of one hundred and twenty (\$120.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of one hundred and twenty (\$120.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did, then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

16

Seventh count.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 16th day of July, A. D. 1915, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Ken-

tucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation, and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency, and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did on the 16th day of July, A. D. 1915, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment, and while he
17 was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of one hundred (\$100.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last-mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing, and, therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of one hundred (\$100.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of one hundred (\$100.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did, then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

18

Eighth count.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 17th day of July, A. D. 1915, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London,

in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency, and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did on the 17th day of July, A. D. 1915, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment,
19 and while he was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of fifty (\$50.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last-mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing, and, therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of fifty (\$50.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of fifty (\$50.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did, then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

20

Ninth Count.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 13th day of August, A. D. 1915, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then

and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation, and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did on the 13th day of August, A. D. 1915, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment,

21 and while he was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of four hundred (\$400.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing and, therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of four hundred (\$400.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of four hundred (\$400.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did, then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

22

Tenth count.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 4th day of September, A. D. 1915, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a

certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency, and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did on the 4th day of September, A. D. 1915 at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment, and while he

23 was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of one hundred (\$100.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing and therefore cannot here set forth), the said sum of one hundred (\$100.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of one hundred (\$100.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did then and there wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

24

Eleventh count.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 11th day of September, A. D. 1915, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and

there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established, and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did, on the 11th day of September, A. D. 1915, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment and while he was so employed and acting as *as* such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of fifty (\$50.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing and, therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of fifty (\$50.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association and which said sum of fifty (\$50.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did, then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds, and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 17th day of November, A. D. 1915, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then

and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency, and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did on the 17th day of November, A. D. 1915, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment
27 and while he was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of sixty (\$60.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last-mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing, and, therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of sixty (\$60.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association and which said sum of sixty (\$60.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did, then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

28

Thirteenth count.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 19th day of November, A. D. 1915, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a

certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency, and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did on the 19th day of November, A. D. 1915, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and

29 district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment and while he was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of forty-three and 33/100 (\$43.33) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last-mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grant jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing, and, therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of forty-three and 33/100 (\$43.33) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of forty-three and 33/100 (\$43.33) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did, then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 3rd day of December, A. D. 1915, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did on the 3rd day of December, A. D. 1915, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment, and while he
31 was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of fifty (\$50.00) dollars (the particular kinds descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing and therefore cannot here set forth), the said sum of fifty (\$50.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of fifty (\$50.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did, then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 7th day of January, A. D. 1916, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established, and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did on the 7th day of January, A. D. 1916, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment and while he was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of two hundred and fifty (\$250.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing and, therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of two hundred and fifty (\$250.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association and which said sum of two hundred and fifty (\$250.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did, then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 18th day of April, A. D. 1916, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency and was then and thereacting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did on the 18th day of April, A. D. 1916, at the said own of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment and

35 while he was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of two hundred (\$200.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last-mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing and, therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of two hundred (\$200.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of two hundred (\$200.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did, then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

Seventeenth count.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 18th day of April, A. D. 1916, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did on the 18th day of April, A. D. 1916, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment and while
37 he was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of two hundred (\$200.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing, and, therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of two hundred (\$200.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of two hundred (\$200.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 2nd day of June, A. D. 1916, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency, and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did on the 2nd day of June, A. D. 1916, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment and while he
39 was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of fifteen (\$15.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last-mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing and, therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of fifteen (\$15.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of fifteen (\$15.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did, then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

Nineteenth count.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 15th day of June, A. D. 1916, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established, and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, and in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, did on the 15th day of June, A. D. 1916, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment,
41 and while he was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of fifty (\$50.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last-mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing and, therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of fifty (\$50.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of fifty (\$50.00) dollars, he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association and so having in his possession and under his control the said moneys and funds last aforesaid, did, then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That on or about the — day of —, A. D. 1914, and between the 24th day of April, A. D. 1914, and the 13th day of August, A. D. 1914, the exact date being to the grand jurors aforesaid unknown, and within three years next before the finding of this indictment, at the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver and agent of the said national banking association, 43 as aforesaid, did on or about the — day of —, A. D. 1914, and between the 24th day of April, A. D. 1914, and the 13th day of August, A. D. 1914, the exact date being to the grand jurors aforesaid unknown, and within three years next before the finding of this indictment, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment and while he was so employed and acting as such receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and under his control certain moneys and funds of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of three thousand (\$3,000.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last mentioned moneys and funds, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing, and, therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of three thousand (\$3,000.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of three thousand (\$3,000.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and under his control the said

moneys and funds last aforesaid, did, then and there, wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys and funds and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

THOS. D. SLATTERY,
United States Attorney.

-44 (Back or cover of indictment.)

United States District Court, Eastern District of Kentucky.

THE UNITED STATES }
vs. } No. 1384.
FRED W. WEITZEL. }

A true bill.

TAYLOR ASBURY,
Foreman Grand Jury.

Filed Oct. 17, 1916.

J. W. MENZIES, *U. S. Clerk.*

Witnesses: John A. Best, D. F. Brown, R. C. Eversole, John Jody,
A. E. Radert.

Indictment for Sec. 5209, R. S. U. S.—Embezzlement.

45

General Demurrer.

Filed June 11th, 1917.

Now comes the defendant, Fred W. Weitzel, and demurs to the indictment herein, and each and every count thereof separately, because the same, and neither of said counts, contain facts sufficient to constitute or charge the defendant with the commission of an offense against the United States.

A. E. STRICKLETT,
Attorney for Defendant.

46

Transcript of Orders.

Filed May 16th, A. D. 1917.

Proceedings had in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, at a regular term of court begun and held in the Federal Court Hall in the city of Covington, on Monday, April 2nd, A. D. 1917, and of our Independence the 141st year.

Court met. Present: Hon. A. M. J. Cochran, judge; J. W. Menzies, U. S. clerk; Thos. D. Slattery, U. S. attorney; R. C. Ford, U. S. marshal.

UNITED STATES, PLAINTIFF, }
 v. } 3796
 FRED W. WEITZEL, DEFENDANT. }

Be it remembered, that heretofore, to-wit, on the 17th day of October, A. D. 1916, an order was made and entered herein, being in words and figures as follows:

UNITED STATES }
 v. } 3796.
 FRED W. WEITZEL }

A true bill.

TAYLOR ASBURY, *Foreman.*

And on the same day, to-wit, on the 17th day of October, A. D. 1916, the following order was made and entered herein:

Order.

This day came the Hon. Thos. D. Slattery, U. S. attorney, and also came the defendant in discharge of the requirement of his bond, and having been formally arraigned, it was thereupon
 47 demanded of him, the said Fred W. Weitzel, of and concerning the charges against him alleged in the indictment herein and he pleads that he is not guilty as charged therein.

Whereupon, on motion of the U. S. attorney, the court being advised, it is now ordered that this case be and the same is continued until the next regular term of court.

Order.

Entered April 2nd, 1917.

This cause coming on for hearing, came the U. S. attorney, and upon his motion, the court being advised, it is ordered that this case be and same is continued and transferred to Catlettsburg for trial on June 11, 1917. And the clerk of the court is directed to transmit to Catlettsburg the papers herein, together with the transcript of the orders that the case be properly docketed.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Eastern District of Kentucky, ss:

I, J. W. Menzies, clerk of the United States District Court, for the Eastern District of Kentucky, at Covington, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of all orders herein in the matter set out in the caption hereto, as the same appears from the records and files of this office.

Witness my hand as clerk and the seal of said court at Covington, Ky., this 15th day of May, A. D. 1917, and of the independence of the United States of America the 141st year.

[SEAL.]

J. W. MENZIES, *Clerk.*
 By O. M. MITCHEL, *D. C.*

48

Indictment.

Ret. and filed at Covington, October 17, 1916, filed at Catlettsburg,
May 16, 1917.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Eastern District of Kentucky, ss.:

In the District Court of the United States of America in and for the Eastern District of Kentucky, held at Covington, Kentucky, at the October term, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixteen:

The grand jurors of the United States of America, impaneled, sworn, and charged to inquire for the body of the said eastern district of Kentucky, at the term aforesaid, and inquiring for that district, upon their oaths present:

That on the 13th day of August, A. D. 1914, in the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver of a certain national banking association, a body corporate, then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, which said national banking association was created and organized on the 27th day of September, 1888, under the laws of the United States, and continued to exist and do business under the said laws from said date to the 2nd day of April, 1914; that on or about the said 2nd day of April, 1914, the said national banking association was declared insolvent and closed by order of the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and that on or about the 9th day of April, 1914, the said Fred W. Weitzel was duly appointed by the said Comptroller of the Currency as receiver of the said national banking association; and that the said Fred W. Weitzel accepted the said appointment as such receiver of the said national banking association, and pursuant to his appointment, took possession and custody of the moneys, funds, and assets of the said national banking association and assumed charge of its affairs;

49 That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did, on the 13th day of August, A. D. 1914, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment, and while he was so employed and acting as such receiver of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and custody and under his control certain moneys, funds, and assets of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of three thousand (\$3,000.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last-mentioned moneys, funds, and assets, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of knowing and therefore cannot here set forth), the said sum of three thousand (\$3,000.00) dollars then and there being the property of the

said national banking association and which said sum of three thousand (\$3,000.00) dollars he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association, and so having in his possession and custody and under his control the said moneys, funds, and assets last aforesaid, did then and there wilfully, knowing, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys, funds, and assets and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

50

Second count.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oath aforesaid, do further present:

That on the 8th day of June, A. D. 1916, in the said district of Kentucky, one Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver of a certain national banking association, a body corporate then and there known and designated as The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, which said national banking association was created and organized on the 27th day of September, 1888, under the laws of the United States, and continued to exist and do business under the said laws from said date to the 2nd day of April, 1914; that on or about the said 2nd day of April, 1914, the said national banking association was declared insolvent and closed by order of the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and that on or about the 9th day of April, 1914, the said Fred W. Weitzel was duly appointed by the said Comptroller of the Currency as receiver of the said national banking association; and that the said Fred W. Weitzel accepted the said appointment as such receiver of the said national banking association, and, pursuant to his appointment, took possession and custody of the moneys, funds, and assets of the said national banking association, and assumed charge of its affairs;

That he, the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being then and there receiver of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, did, on the 8th day of June, A. D. 1916, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district

51 aforesaid, by virtue of his said office and employment and while he was so employed and acting as such receiver of the said national banking association as aforesaid, have, receive, and take into his possession and custody and under his control certain moneys, funds, and assets of the said national banking association, to a large amount and of great value, to wit, to the amount and of the value of fifty (\$50.00) dollars (the particular kinds, descriptions, numbers, amounts, and values of which last-mentioned moneys, funds, and assets, respectively, the grand jurors aforesaid have no means of

knowing, and, therefore, cannot here set forth), the said sum of fifty (\$50.00) dollars then and there being the property of the said national banking association, and which said sum of fifty (\$50.00) dollars, he the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver as aforesaid, held for and in the name and on account of the said national banking association and so having in his possession and custody and under his control the said moneys, funds, and assets last aforesaid, did then and there wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to injure and defraud the said national banking association, embezzle the said moneys, funds, and assets and convert the same to his own use;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

THOS. D. SLATTERY,
United States Attorney.

52

(Back or cover of indictment.)

United States District Court, Eastern District of Kentucky.

THE UNITED STATES	} No. 1386.
<i>vs.</i>	
FRED W. WEITZEL.	

Indictment for sec. 5209, R. S. U. S.—Embezzlement.
A true bill.

TAYLOR ASBURY, *Foreman Grand Jury.*

Filed Oct. 17, 1916.

J. W. MENZIES, *U. S. Clerk.*

Witnesses: John A. Best, D. F. Brown, R. C. Eversole, John Jody,
A. E. Radert.

53

Demurrer.

Filed June 11, 1917.

Now comes the defendant, Fred W. Weitzel, and demurs to the indictment herein, and each and every count thereof separately because same, and neither of said counts, contain or charge the defendant with commission of an offense against the United States.

A. E. STRICKLETT,
Attorney for defendant.

Order.

Entered June 11th, 1917, by A. M. J. Cochran, judge.

This day came the defendant and filed demurrer herein to the indictment and each paragraph thereof. Whereupon, came the United States attorney, and, on his motion, the court being advised, it is

now ordered that this cause be and same is consolidated with the case of United States vs. Fred W. Weitzel, No. 1384.

54

Transcript of orders.

Filed May 16th, 1917.

Proceedings had in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky at a regular term begun and held in the Federal Court Hall, in the city of Covington, on Monday, April 2nd, A. D. 1917, and of our Independence the 141st year.

Court met. Present: Hon. A. M. J. Cochran, judge; J. W. Menzies, U. S. clerk; Thos. D. Slattery, U. S. attorney; R. C. Ford, U. S. marshal.

UNITED STATES, PLAINTIFF,	} 3797.
v.	
FRED W. WEITZEL, DEFENDANT.	

Be it remembered that heretofore, to wit, on the 17th day of October, A. D. 1916, an order was made and entered herein, being, in words and figures, as follows:

UNITED STATES	} 3797.
v.	
FRED W. WEITZEL	

A true bill.

TAYLOR ASBURY, *Foreman.*

And on the same day, to wit, on the 17th day of October, A. D. 1916, the following order was made and entered herein:

Order.

This day came the Hon. Thos. D. Slattery, U. S. attorney, and also came the defendant in discharge of the requirement of his bond, and having been formally arraigned it was thereupon demanded of
55 him, the said Fred W. Weitzel, of and concerning the charges against him alleged in the indictment herein, and he pleads that he is not guilty as charged therein.

Whereupon, on motion of the U. S. attorney, the court being advised, it is now ordered that this cause be, and the same is, continued until the next regular term of court.

Order.

Entered April 2, 1917.

This cause coming on for hearing, came the U. S. attorney and, upon his motion, the court being advised, it is ordered that

this case be, and the same is, continued and transferred to Catlettsburg for trial on June 11, 1917. And the clerk of the court is directed to transmit to Catlettsburg the papers herein, together with the transcript of the orders, that the case may be properly docketed.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Eastern District of Kentucky.

I, J. W. Menzies, clerk of the United States District Court for the eastern district of Kentucky, at Covington, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of all orders herein in the matter set out in the caption hereto, as the same appears from the records and files of this office.

Witness my hand as clerk and the seal of said court at Covington, Ky., this 15th day of May, A. D. 1917, and of the independence of the United States of America the 141st year.

[SEAL.]

J. W. MENZIES, *Clerk.*
By O. M. MITCHELL, *D. C.*

56

Indictment.

Ret. and filed at Covington, October 17, 1916. Filed at Catlettsburg, May 16, 1917.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Eastern District of Kentucky, ss:

In the District Court of the United States of America, in and for the Eastern District of Kentucky, held at Covington, Kentucky, at the October term, in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and sixteen.

The grand jurors of the United States of America, impaneled, sworn, and charged to inquire for the body of the said eastern district of Kentucky, at the term aforesaid, and inquiring for that district, upon their oaths present:

That on or about the ——— day of ———, A. D. 1914, the exact date being to the grand jurors aforesaid unknown, at the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, and the district aforesaid, and within the jurisdiction of this court, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, to wit, The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London and county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States; and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the

receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having
57 theretofore been duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, on or about the — day of —, A. D. 1914, the exact date being to the grand jurors aforesaid unknown, then and there made and transmitted to the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States of America a certain report of the condition of the said national banking association as of the close of business on the thirtieth day of June, in the year, 1914, according to a certain form theretofore prescribed by the Comptroller of the currency of the United States for the time being, which report was a report which it was then and there by law the duty of the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent of the said national banking association, to make and transmit to the said comptroller, in accordance with the provisions of Sec. 5234 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and which said report was signed by the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid;

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oath aforesaid, do further present that the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, on or about the said — day of —, A. D. 1914, the exact date being to the grand jurors aforesaid unknown, then and there, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, did wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, and feloniously make a certain false entry in the said report, under the and heading of "Assets," in the words and figures following, to wit:

58 5. Additional assets coming into possession of receiver since suspension (schedule A), total 1,047.17; which said entry, so made as aforesaid, then and there purported to show, and did in substance and effect indicate and declare, that the total amount of additional assets coming into possession of the receiver of the said national banking association since the suspension of the said national banking association, at the date of the said report, to wit, on the thirtieth day of June, 1914, was the sum of one thousand forty-seven and 17/100 (\$1,047.17) dollars; whereas, in truth and in fact, the total amount of additional assets coming into possession of the receiver of the said national banking association since the suspension of the said national banking association, at the date of the said report, to wit, on the thirtieth day of June, 1914, was a different and much larger sum, to wit, the sum of four thousand forty-seven and 17/100 (\$4,047.17) dollars; and that the said Fred W. Weitzel, so

being receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, did then and there make the said false entry in the said report of the said national banking association as aforesaid, well knowing that the said entry was then and there false, with the intent in him, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, to deceive the said Comptroller of the Currency and other persons to the grand jurors aforesaid unknown;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

59

Second count.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oath aforesaid, do further present:

That on or about the — day of —, A. D. 1914, the exact date being to the grand jurors aforesaid unknown, at the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and the district aforesaid, and within the jurisdiction of this court, one Fred W. Weitzel was the receiver and agent of a certain national banking association, to wit, The First National Bank of London, in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky, which said national banking association had been theretofore created, organized, and established and was then existing in the town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State of Kentucky and district aforesaid, under the laws of the United States; the said national banking association being then and there in the process of liquidation and the winding up of its business and affairs, pursuant to proper orders theretofore duly made by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States, and the said Fred W. Weitzel was then and there the receiver and agent and in custody and control of the books, records, and assets of the said national banking association, having been theretofore duly appointed as such receiver and agent by the said Comptroller of the Currency and was then and there acting as such receiver and agent under the direction of the said Comptroller of the Currency;

That the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent of the said national banking association, as aforesaid, on or about the — day of —, A. D. 1914, the exact date being to the grand jurors aforesaid unknown, then and there made and transmitted to the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States of America a certain

60 report of the condition of the said national banking association, as of the close of business on the thirtieth day of September, in the year 1914, according to a certain form theretofore prescribed by the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States for the time being, which report was a report which it was then and

there by law the duty of the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent of the said national banking association, to make and transmit to the said comptroller, in accordance with the provisions of section 5234 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and which said report was signed by the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid;

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oath aforesaid, do further present that the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, on or about the said — day of —, A. D. 1914, the exact date being to the grand jurors aforesaid unknown, then and there, at the said town of London, in the county of Laurel, in the State and district aforesaid, did wilfully, knowingly, wrongfully, unlawfully, and feloniously make a certain false entry in the said report, under the heading of "disposition of assets," and under the subheading, "Amount collected by receiver to date," in the words and figures following, to wit:

10. From additional assets acquired since suspension (Schedule E), total \$2,416.76; which said entry, so made as aforesaid, then and there purported to show, and did in substance and effect indicate and declare, that the total amount collected from additional assets acquired since the suspension of the said national banking association, by the said receiver of the said national banking association, at the date of the said report, to wit, on the thirtieth day of September, 1914, was the sum of two thousand four hundred sixteen and 76/100 (\$2,416.76) dollars; whereas, in truth and in fact, the total amount collected from additional assets acquired since the suspension of the said national banking association, by the said receiver of the said national banking association, at the date of the said report, to wit, on the thirtieth day of September, 1914, was a different and much larger sum, to wit, the sum of five thousand four hundred sixteen and 76/100 (\$5,416.76) dollars; and that the said Fred W. Weitzel, so being receiver and agent of the said national banking association as aforesaid, did then and there make the said false entry in the said report of the said national banking association as aforesaid, well knowing that the said entry was then and there false, with the intent in him, the said Fred W. Weitzel, receiver and agent as aforesaid, to deceive the said Comptroller of the Currency and other persons to the grand jurors aforesaid unknown;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

THOS. D. SLATTERY,
United States Attorney.

62

(Back or cover of indictment.)

United States District Court, Eastern District of Kentucky.

THE UNITED STATES
vs.
 FRED W. WEITZEL. } No. 1387.

Indict for sec. 5209, R. S. U. S.—False entries in reports.
 A true bill.

TAYLOR ASBURY,
Foreman, Grand Jury.

Filed Oct. 17, 1916.

J. W. MENZIES,
U. S. Clerk.

Witnesses: A. E. Radert, John Jody, R. C. Eversole, B. F. Brown,
 John A. Best.

63

Demurrer.

Filed June 11th, 1917.

Now comes the defendant, Fred W. Weitzel, and demurs to the indictment herein and each and every count thereof because the same and neither of said counts contain facts sufficient to constitute or charge the defendant with the commission of an offense against the United States.

A. E. STRICKLETT,
Atty. for Defendant.

Order.

Entered June 11th, 1917, by A. M. J. Cochran, Judge.

This day came the defendant and filed demurrer herein to the indictment and each paragraph thereof. Whereupon came the United States attorney, and on his motion, the court being advised, it is now ordered that this cause be and same is consolidated with the case of United States vs. Fred W. Weitzel, No. 1384.

64

Opinion.

Filed June 11, 1917.

These consolidated causes are before me on defendant's demurrers to the indictments. The sufficiency thereof depends on the question whether a receiver of a national banking association, appointed by

the comptroller under the statutory provisions authorizing him to make such appointments is an agent of such an association under Section 5209, U. S. Rev. Stat. If he is not, it is not claimed that the indictments are good.

It will be noted that the section does not cover every person who is entrusted with the funds and assets of a national banking association, but six different classes of persons sustaining a certain relation to the association and who, by virtue of such relation, may have custody and possession thereof. Unless then a receiver, so appointed, comes within these classes he is not covered by the section. It is not claimed that he comes within any of them except the last. He does not come within it because he is not appointed by the banking association but by the comptroller. The word "agent" itself implies that he is appointed by the association. No one can be said to be the agent of another unless he has been chosen expressly or impliedly to act for him and on his behalf. It is a case also for the application of the maxim "Noscitur a socius." As to each of the five other classes the relation is brought about by the act of the Association.

The receiver of such an association is a public officer and
65 not an agent of the association. This is so, notwithstanding he hold the assets of the association in trust for the benefit of it, its stockholders and creditors. It is hardly conceivable that if Congress by section 5209 had intended to cover a receiver that it would not have named him expressly. It provided in the same legislation for the appointment of a receiver by the comptroller and also for the appointment of an agent by the shareholders of the association in a certain contingency. Such an agent comes within the description of section 5209 and a receiver does not.

The demurrers are sustained and each of the indictments quashed and dismissed.

A. M. J. COCHRAN, *Judge.*

June 11, 1917.

Order.

Entered June 11, 1917, by A. M. J. Cochran, Judge.

This day came defendant by counsel and produced and filed demurrer to the indictments and each and every count thereof. The court heard argument upon said demurrers and being fully advised, files its written opinion herein. It is therefore ordered and adjudged by the court that the demurrers be and they are each sustained in the consolidated causes Nos. 1384, 1386, and 1387, for the reasons set out in the written opinion filed herein, to which ruling of the court the United States by its attorney objects and excepts.

66

Petition for writ of error.

Filed July 3, 1917.

Now comes Thos. D. Slattery, United States attorney within the Eastern District of Kentucky, for and on behalf of the United States, the plaintiff herein, and says:

That on or about the 11th day of June, 1917, this court entered judgment herein in favor of the defendant and against the plaintiff, the United States of America, in which judgment and proceeding had prior thereto in this cause, certain errors were committed to the prejudice of this plaintiff, all of which will more in detail appear from the assignment of errors which is filed with this petition.

Wherefore, the plaintiff prays that a writ of error may issue in this behalf out of the Supreme Court of the United States for the correction of errors so complained of, and that a transcript of the record, proceedings and papers in this case, duly authenticated, may be sent to the Supreme Court of the United States.

THOS. D. SLATTERY,
United States Attorney.

67

Assignment of errors.

Filed July 3'', 1917.

The plaintiff in this action, the United States of America, by its attorney, Thomas D. Slattery, United States attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky, in connection with its petition for a writ of error, makes the following assignment of errors, which it avers exist:

First. That the court erred in sustaining the demurrers of defendant to indictments numbered 1384, 1386, and 1387, consolidated herein.

Second. The court erred in holding as a matter of law that the receiver of a national banking association does not come within the provisions of section 5209 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Third. The court erred in holding as a matter of law that the word "Agent," as used in section 5209 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, does not include the receiver of a national banking association.

Fourth. The court erred in holding as a matter of law that the receiver of a national banking association is not the agent of such association within the purpose and meaning of section 5209 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Fifth. The court erred in quashing and dismissing the indictment herein.

68 Wherefore, the plaintiff prays that the judgment of the court be reversed.

THOS. D. SLATTERY,
United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

Order.

Entered by A. M. J. Cochran, Judge, July 3rd, A. D. 1917.

This 3rd day of July, 1917, comes the plaintiff, the United States of America, by Thos. D. Slattery, United States attorney within the eastern district of Kentucky, and files herein and presents to the court his petition, praying for the allowance of a writ of error, and assignment of errors intended to be urged by him; praying also that a transcript of the record and proceedings and the papers upon which the judgment herein was rendered, duly authenticated, may be sent to the Supreme Court of the United States; and such other and further proceedings may be had as are proper in the premises.

On consideration whereof, the court allows the writ of error.

A. M. J. COCHRAN,

United States Judge, Eastern District of Kentucky.

69

Præcipe for transcript of record.

Filed July 3rd, 1917.

To J. W. MENZIES, *Clerk of said Court:*

You will please make transcripts of the following portions of the papers and records in the above-styled case.

1. The indictments Nos. 1384, 1386, 1387, consolidated.
2. The demurrer filed to the indictments consolidated.
3. The opinion of the court sustaining the demurrer to the indictments consolidated.
4. The judgment of the court.
5. All orders made and entered in this case.
6. Assignment of errors.
7. Application for writ.
8. Order allowing the writ.
9. Citation.

THOS D. SLATTERY,

United States Attorney.

I hereby, this 30th day of June, 1917, accept personal service of the præcipe on behalf of Fred W. Weitzel, defendant.

A. E. STRICKLETT,

Attorney for Defendant.

70

Writ of error.

Issued July 3rd, 1917.

United States Supreme Court, United States of America.

The President of the United States to the honorable the judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, greeting:

Because in the record and proceedings, as also in the rendition of the judgment of a plea which is in the said District Court, before

you, or some of you, between the United States, plaintiff in error, and Fred W. Weitzel, defendant in error, a manifest error hath happened, to the great damage of the said United States, plaintiff in error, as by its complaint appears. We being willing that error, if any hath been, should be duly corrected, and full and speedy justice done to the parties aforesaid in this behalf, do command you, if the judgment be therein given, that then under your seal, distinctly and openly, you send the record and proceedings aforesaid, with all things concerning the same, to the Supreme Court of the United States, together with this writ, so that you have the same at Washington, on the first day of August next, in the said Supreme Court of the United States, to be then and there held, that the record and proceedings aforesaid being inspected, the said Supreme Court of the United States may cause further to be done therein to correct that error, what of right, and according to the laws and customs of the United States, should be done.

Witness the honorable Edward D. White, Chief Justice of
71 the United States, the 3rd day of July, in the year of our
Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventeen and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-first year.

[SEAL.]

J. W. MENZIES,

Clerk of the District Court of the United States.

Allowed by

A. M. J. COCHRAN,

United States District Judge.

72

Clerk's certificate.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Eastern District of Kentucky.

I, J. W. Menzies, clerk of the United States District Court in and for the Eastern District of Kentucky, at Catlettsburg, do hereby certify that the foregoing 71 pages contain a full, true, and complete transcript of the record in the case of United States of America, as plaintiff in error, against Fred W. Weitzel, defendant in error, as the same appears from the records and files of this office and as called for by the praecipe for record filed in this case.

Witness my hand as clerk and the seal of said court, at Catlettsburg, this 7th day of July, A. D. 1917, and of our Independence the 142nd year.

[SEAL.]

J. W. MENZIES, *Clerk.*

73 United States District Court, Eastern District of Kentucky,
Catlettsburg.

1384

Original citation.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Eastern District of Kentucky, ss:

To Fred W. Weitzel, greeting:

You are hereby cited and admonished to be and appear at a session of the United States Supreme Court, to be holden in the city of Washington on the 1st day of August, next, pursuant to a writ of error filed in the clerk's office of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky, wherein the United States is plaintiff in error and Fred W. Weitzel is defendant in error, to show cause, if any there is, why the judgment rendered against the said plaintiff, as in said writ of error mentioned, should not be corrected, and why speedy justice should not be done to the parties in that behalf.

Witness my hand as judge of the said District Court and seal of said court this 3 day of July, 1917.

A. M. J. COCHRAN,
*Judge of United States Court,
Eastern District of Kentucky.*

I hereby accept due personal service of the citation in behalf of Fred W. Weitzel, defendant in error, this 9th day of July, 1917.

FRED W. WEITZEL,
By A. E. STRICKLETT,
His Attorney.

(Indorsement on cover:) File No. 26,034. E. Kentucky D. C., U. S. Term No. 567. The United States, plaintiff in error, vs. Fred W. Weitzel. Filed July 11th, 1917. File No. 26,034.

In the Supreme Court of the United States.

OCTOBER TERM, 1917.

THE UNITED STATES, PLAINTIFF IN ERROR,

v.

FRED W. WEITZEL.

} No. 567.

IN ERROR TO THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

MOTION BY THE UNITED STATES TO ADVANCE.

Comes now the Solicitor General and in accordance with the provisions of the Criminal Appeals Act, 34 Stat. 1246, moves the court to advance the above-entitled cause for hearing on a day convenient to the court.

Defendant was the *receiver* of the First National Bank of London, Kentucky. He was indicted in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky for embezzling certain funds and making false entries in certain reports required by law to be furnished to the Comptroller of the Currency while acting as such receiver, in violation of section 5209 of the Revised Statutes, which provides, *inter alia*, that:

Every * * * agent of any [national banking] association who embezzles, ab-

stracts, or willfully misapplies any of the moneys, funds, or credits of the association; * * * or who makes any false entry in any * * * report * * * of the association, with intent * * * to injure or defraud the association or any other company, body politic or corporate, or any individual person, or to deceive any officer of the association, or any agent appointed to examine the affairs of any such association * * * shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be imprisoned * * *.

The district court sustained demurrers to the indictments, holding, among other things, that a *receiver* of a national bank appointed by the proper authority of the Government *is not an agent* of the bank within the meaning of section 5209.

Notice of this motion has been served on opposing counsel.

JOHN W. DAVIS,
Solicitor General.

JANUARY, 1918.

INDEX AND SUMMARY.

	Page.
STATEMENT	1
THE MOTION TO DISMISS	3
ARGUMENT:	
I. The powers, functions, and duties of a national-bank receiver are such as constitute him an "agent" of the bank, within the broad meaning of that word, as used in Revised Statutes, section 5209	4
(1) The statutes relating to national bank receivers	5
(2) The duty of a national-bank receiver	8
(3) The appointment of a receiver does not work a dissolution of the bank	9
(4) The receiver represents the bank	11
II. Revised Statutes, section 5209, was intended to cover the whole ground of defalcations which might be committed by all those who might have any connection with, or control over, the assets, funds, credits, books, and papers of a national bank	12
III. A national-bank receiver is not an officer of any court and has not the status of a judicial receiver. He is simply a liquidating agent, provided for the bank by the statute. In accepting its charter, the bank accepts all the provisions of the National Bank Act, including the provision for the appointment of such a liquidating agent or receiver; and when such a receiver is appointed as such an agent by the Comptroller, his appointment is impliedly authorized by the bank	19

IV. The functions and duties of a receiver are substantially the same as those of liquidating agent of the bank provided for impliedly under Revised Statutes, section 5220, and expressly under section 3 of the Act of June 30, 1876. Such a liquidating agent and a receiver both represent the bank in its corporate capacity and act for its benefit. A liquidating agent has been held by the courts to be indictable under Revised Statutes, section 5209.

Page.
23

V. A national-bank receiver is not an officer of the United States within the purview of Federal criminal statutes punishing crimes committed by such officers.

29

VI. The fact that for the limited purpose of suing in the Federal courts a national-bank receiver has been held to be an officer of the United States, as that term is used in statutes granting jurisdiction to Federal courts, is not incompatible with the status of the receiver as an agent of the bank. To this extent he acts in a dual capacity.

33

VII. The opinion filed by the lower court contains not sufficient reasoning to establish the point decided. It holds that a receiver is a public officer and not an agent, but states the point as if it were axiomatic and needed no citation of authority or reason.

37

CONCLUSION

40

APPENDIX

41

CITATIONS.

CASES.

	Page.
<i>Alabama & V. Ry. Co. v. Odenear</i> (1895), 93 Miss. 34	21
<i>Armstrong v. Trautman</i> (1888), 36 Fed. 275	36
<i>Auten v. United States National Bank of New York</i> (1899), 174 U. S. 125	36
<i>Bank of Bethel v. Palquiogue Bank</i> (1871), 14 Wall. 383	10
<i>Bank v. Kennedy</i> (1872), 17 Wall. 19	8
<i>Case v. Terrell</i> (1870), 11 Wall. 199	11
<i>Chemical National Bank v. Hartford Deposit Co.</i> (1896), 161 U. S. 1	9
<i>Chicago, R. I. & Pac. Ry. Co. v. Zernecke</i> (1902), 183 U. S. 582	21
<i>Clement v. Canfield</i> (1856), 28 Vt. 302	15
<i>Commonwealth v. Wyman</i> (1844), 8 Metcalf, 247	14
<i>Fairbanks v. United States</i> (1901), 181 U. S. 283	13
<i>Frelinghuysen v. Baldwin</i> (1882), 12 Fed. 395	36
<i>Gibson v. Peters</i> (1893), 150 U. S. 342	36
<i>Guarantee Co. of North Dakota v. Hanway</i> (1900), 104 Fed. 369	25, 30
<i>Hendee v. Connecticut & P. R. R. Co.</i> (1886) 26 Fed. 677	36
<i>In re Chetwood</i> (1897), 165 U. S. 443	4, 36
<i>Interstate Consolidated Street Ry. Co. v. Massachusetts</i> (1907), 207 U. S. 79	21
<i>Jackson v. Fidelity & Casualty Co. of New York</i> (1896), 75 Fed. 359	11
<i>Jewett v. United States</i> (1900), 100 Fed. 832	17, 24, 27
<i>Kennedy v. Gibson</i> (1869), 8 Wall. 498	12, 34
<i>Lamar v. United States</i> (1916), 240 U. S. 60	36
<i>McConville v. Gilmour et al.</i> (1888), 36 Fed. 277	25
<i>Martin v. United States</i> (1909), 168 Fed. 198	31
<i>Metz v. Buffalo, etc., R. R.</i> (1874), 58 N. Y. 61	21
<i>Murray v. Chambers</i> (1907), 151 Fed. 142	36
<i>Newburyport Water Co. v. Newburyport</i> (1904), 193 U. S. 561	21
<i>Old Wayne Life Association v. McDonough</i> (1907), 204 U. S. 821	20



In the Supreme Court of the United States.

OCTOBER TERM, 1917.

THE UNITED STATES, PLAINTIFF IN ERROR,	} No. 567.
v.	
FRED W. WEITZEL.	

*IN ERROR TO THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY.*

STATEMENT.

The defendant in error was indicted in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky for embezzlement of the moneys, funds and credits of a national banking association in violation of the provisions of Section 5209 of the Revised Statutes of the United States. A demurrer to this indictment was sustained by the lower court, and the ruling is brought to this Court for review under the Criminal Appeals Act of March 2, 1907, c. 2564 (34 Stat. 1246).

The First National Bank of London, Ky., was duly organized under the national banking laws and authorized to commence the business of banking on September 27, 1888. This bank continued to transact business until April 2, 1914, when it was closed by order of the Comptroller of the

Currency, and its affairs were placed in the hands of National Bank Examiner W. P. Kinchloe as temporary receiver. On April 9, 1914, the Comptroller of the Currency appointed Fred W. Weitzel, defendant in error herein, as permanent receiver of the association. Pursuant to such appointment, said Weitzel forthwith took charge of the assets of the association and continued to act as receiver thereof until July 19, 1916, upon which date his resignation was tendered and accepted.

On October 17, 1916, three indictments were returned against Weitzel under Section 5209 of the Revised Statutes, which provided as follows:

Every president, director, cashier, teller, clerk, or agent of any association, who embezzles, abstracts, or wilfully misapplies any of the moneys, funds, or credits of the association; or who, without authority from the directors, issues or puts in circulation any of the notes of the association; or who, without such authority, issues or puts forth any certificate of deposit, draws any order or bill of exchange, makes any acceptance, assigns any note, bond, draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree; or who makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of the association, with intent, in either case, to injure or defraud the association or any other company, body politic or corporate, or any individual person, or to deceive any officer of the association, or any agent appointed to examine the affairs of any such association;

and every person who with like intent aids or abets any officer, clerk, or agent in any violation of this section, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be imprisoned not less than five years nor more than ten.

The indictments charged in various counts of similar tenor that certain moneys, funds, and credits of the association came into his possession by virtue of his office and employment as receiver and agent of the said national banking association, which said moneys, funds and credits he embezzled and converted to his own use and benefit. (Record, 2-32.)

These indictments were held demurrable by the District Court solely on the ground that the receiver of a national banking association is not an agent of such association within the meaning of said Section 5209 of the Revised Statutes.

THE MOTION TO DISMISS.

Defendant in error has filed a motion to dismiss on the ground that the Supreme Court has not jurisdiction, inasmuch as the case does not come within the provision of Section 238 of the Judicial Code, and that the writ of error should have been to the Circuit Court of Appeals as provided in Section 128 of the Judicial Code.

The contention is based on air. The writ of error to the United States District Court is sued out in this case under the provisions of the Criminal Appeals Act of March 2, 1907, c. 2564 (34 Stat. 1246),

claims belonging to it, and, upon the order of a court of record of competent jurisdiction, may sell or compound all bad or doubtful debts, and, on a like order, may sell all the real and personal property of such association, on such terms as the court shall direct; and may, if necessary, to pay the debts of such association, enforce the individual liability of the stockholders. Such receiver shall pay over all money so made to the Treasurer of the United States, subject to the order of the Comptroller, and also make report to the Comptroller of all his acts and proceedings.

A receiver may also be appointed by the Comptroller of the Currency to wind up the affairs of the bank in the following cases:

If cancellation of stock has paid for reduces the capital below the minimum required by law (Sec. 5141);

In case of deficiency of surplus in certain banks (Sec. 5151);

If the bank's reserve falls below the required amount (Sec. 5191);

If a bank organized in the cities named in Sec. 5191 fails to select a bank in New York to redeem its notes or fails to redeem its notes (Sec. 5195);

If the bank loans on its own shares or purchases its own shares (Sec. 5201);

If the capital is impaired (Sec. 5205);

If bank officers, clerks, or agents certify checks illegally (Sec. 5208);

The Act of June 30, 1875, c. 156 (19 Stat. 637), section 1, provided for the appointment of a receiver as follows:

That whenever any national banking association shall be dissolved, and its rights, privileges, and franchises declared forfeited, as prescribed in section fifty-two hundred and thirty-nine of the Revised Statutes of the United States, or whenever any creditor of any national banking association shall have obtained a judgment against it in any court of record, and made application, accompanied by a certificate from the clerk of the court stating that such judgment has been rendered and has remained unpaid for the space of thirty days, or whenever the Comptroller shall become satisfied of the insolvency of a national banking association he may, after due examination of its affairs, in either case, appoint a receiver, who shall proceed to close up such association and enforce the personal liability of the shareholders, as provided in section fifty-two hundred and thirty-four of said statutes.

The Act of March 29, 1886, c. 28 (24 Stat. 8), provided that under certain conditions the receiver of a bank might purchase real or personal property on which the bank held a mortgage or pledge.

By Revised Statutes, Sec. 5238, it is provided that the expenses of a receivership are to be paid out of the bank's assets.

All expenses of any receivership shall be paid out of the assets of such association before distribution of the proceeds thereof.

(2) THE DUTY OF A NATIONAL BANK RECEIVER.

The duty of the receiver is set forth in *Bank v. Kennedy* (1872), 17 Wall. 19, 22, 23, as follows:

His very appointment makes it his duty to collect the assets and debts of the association. With regard to ordinary assets and debts no special direction is needed; no unusual exercise of judgment is required. They are to be collected of course; that is what the receiver is appointed to do.

The chief duty of the receiver being to collect the assets of the bank and to convert the same into cash as expeditiously as possible, in the performance of these duties it is common knowledge that it may be necessary for the receiver—

To employ such competent force of employees, assistants, and counsel, and incur such expenses as may be necessary in carrying out his functions;

To bring or defend suits;

To allow debtors of the bank to offset deposit balances and other claims against balances due to the bank;

To sell property of the bank or compromise bad or doubtful debts on permission of the court; and to accept assets of other kinds in payment of or in lieu of notes or bills receivable held by the bank, and to administer such new assets;

To sell securities held as collateral under the terms of the agreement by which the collateral is held;

In certain cases to use and invest funds of the bank to purchase property in order to protect equities owned by the bank (See Act of March 29, 1886, *supra*);

To act in the affairs of debtors to the bank in such manner as a creditor may usually act;

A receiver may, with the consent of the Comptroller, pay off incumbrances and remove clouds to the title, when a receiver has legal title to any property, whether real or personal, and such property is subject to an incumbrance such as unpaid taxes, a mortgage, etc.

(3) THE APPOINTMENT OF A RECEIVER DOES NOT WORK
A DISSOLUTION OF THE BANK.

The appointment of a receiver by the Comptroller of the Currency to wind up the affairs of a national bank does not work its dissolution or affect suits pending against it, or incapacitate it from suing or being sued. Its corporate existence continues after the appointment of a receiver and until its affairs have been finally wound up. In *Chemical National Bank v. Hartford Deposit Company* (1896), 161 U. S. 1, this Court said (p. 7):

It thus appears that by the terms of the statutes the corporation continues, notwithstanding the appointment of a receiver, if its corporate life has not been extinguished by lapse of time, by any provision of its articles, by any action of its stockholders, or by any

judgment of forfeiture. The receiver is indeed appointed to close up the association; that is to say, to wind up its business, get in its assets, and pay its debts, and, if need be, to enforce the personal liability of its shareholders for all its "contracts, debts, and engagements"; but the corporation lingers while this is being done, and on occasion, when the receiver has discharged his duty with the satisfactory results enumerated and assets remain, an agent may be chosen, who may sue and be sued in the name of the association in the conduct of the final liquidation. Of course when insolvency is declared the corporation is incapacitated from doing any new business. It has ceased to be a going concern, but it still survives for the purpose of the discharge of its liabilities and the final distribution of its remaining assets when that has been accomplished. No refinement of construction leads to any other result, and numerous decisions preclude further discussion.

In *Bank of Bethel v. Pahquioque Bank* (1871), 14 Wall. 383, 400, the effect of the appointment of a receiver is thus described:

Beyond doubt the appointment of a receiver supersedes the power of the directors to exercise the incidental powers necessary to carry on the business of banking, as the receiver is required to take possession of the books, records, and assets of every description of the association, and from that moment

the association is forbidden to pay out any of its notes, discount any notes or bills, or otherwise prosecute the business of banking, but the corporate franchise of the association is not dissolved, and the association, as a legal entity, continues to exist. * * *

In *Rosenblatt v. Johnston* (1881), 104 U. S. 462, 463, it is said that the bank's "property and assets, in legal contemplation, still belong to the bank, though in the hands of a receiver, to be administered under the law. The bank did not cease to exist on the appointment of the receiver."

A receivership may be of a temporary or provisional nature, and may last only long enough to satisfy the Comptroller that the bank is not insolvent, or that the facts do not present a case for a receiver as provided by the statute—see *Jackson v. Fidelity & Casualty Co. of New York* (C. C. A. 5th Circ. 1896), 75 Fed. 359, 364—and the interruption to the ordinary business of the bank may therefore be of a purely temporary nature.

(4). THE RECEIVER REPRESENTS THE BANK.

In *Case v. Terrell* (1870), 11 Wall. 199, it was held that the receiver of a national bank represents the bank, its stockholders, and creditors, and that neither he nor the Comptroller of the Currency can subject the Government to the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts to determine the conflicting claims of the United States and other creditors in the hands of such a bank. In the course of the opinion,

Mr. Justice Miller, speaking for the Court, said (p. 202):

We are quite at loss to know on what principle the jurisdiction in the present case is asserted, for the briefs for the appellees are devoted wholly to the merits of the controversy. But we must suppose that it is claimed on the ground that the receiver and comptroller, both of whom appeared and answered the bill, represent the United States, and can subject the Government to the jurisdiction of the court.

As to the receiver, the claim, if any such be made, is not worth serious consideration. He represents the bank, its stockholders, its creditors, and does not in any sense represent the Government. [Italics ours.]

In *Kennedy v. Gibson* (1869), 8 Wall. 498, 506, it was said:

The receiver is the statutory assignee of the association and is the proper party to institute all suits. * * * He represents both the creditors and the association.

II.

Revised Statutes, section 5209, was intended to cover the whole ground of defalcations which might be committed by all those who might have any connection with, or control over, the assets, funds, credits, books and papers of a national bank.

In the first place, it should be particularly noted that although the National Bank Act was passed in 1863—55 years ago—this case is the first instance, so far as the reports show, in which the contention

has ever been raised that an embezzling national bank receiver was not punishable under the Act, like any other embezzling representative of the bank. Since it would strain the credulity of the hardiest optimist as to human nature to believe that this is the first instance of a dishonest bank receiver, it would seem that the point would have been taken by some keen attorney during these 55 years "if it had been supposed by anyone that such legislation" failed to provide for such prosecution.

As was said (although in a different connection) by the dissenting Justices (Harlan, Gray, White, and McKenna) in *Fairbanks v. United States* (1901), 181 U. S. 283, 323:

It is said that the question of power never was presented for judicial determination prior to the present case, and therefore this court is at liberty to determine the matter as if now for the first time presented. But the answer to that suggestion is that, in view of the frequent legislation by Congress and its enforcement for nearly a century, the question must have arisen if it had been supposed by anyone that such legislation infringed the constitutional rights of the citizen.

Embezzlement by a receiver falls squarely within the evil at which Revised Statutes, Section 5209, was aimed, and the statute should be so construed as to effectuate its evident intent.

The statute punishes the acts of three classes of persons: (a) President, director, cashier, teller; (b) clerk; (c) agent.

The first class (a) are referred to in the section as "officers," for it provides that "every person who with like intent aids or abets any *officer*, clerk, or agent in any violation of this section," etc. These three classes of persons were clearly intended to include every person acting for the bank who would have any control over its funds, credits, books, or papers.

The end at which this section was directed was well expressed by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts in one of Daniel Webster's most famous criminal cases, *Commonwealth v. Wyman* (1844), 8 Metcalf, 247, in which, construing another embezzlement statute, it said (p. 252):

And against whom was the act intended thus to guard the property of a bank and its depositors, but against those whose connexion with the bank was such that they were either entitled to the custody of the property, or by their situations were brought in continual contact with it? Against those peculiarly exposed to the temptation, and over whom, therefore, a strong arm was to be held; and this would necessarily include all its officers, from the highest to the lowest * * *.

(P. 253:) Being within the mischief, they are intended to be reached by the remedy.

In *State v. Barter* (1879), 58 N. H. 604, the court, construing an embezzlement statute penalizing "any officer, agent, or servant of any corporation," said (p. 605):

The meaning of these comprehensive terms is not restricted by authorities relating to

statutes of a narrower purpose. * * * Officer, clerks, servants, and agents, by virtue of their employment, having property of others rightfully in their possession, and converting it, not by a technical trespass, *but in violation of a trust reposed in them*, had been held not guilty of larceny on account of the lawfulness of their possession. The statute was designed to correct the evil introduced by the decisions in such cases. And the evil of embezzlement by agents was not confined to instances in which the fiduciary relation was of long duration, or was accompanied by compensation, or a certain measured extent, exclusiveness, or subordination of service.

In *Wynegar v. State* (1901), 157 Ind. 577, 579, 580, the court, construing an embezzlement statute, said:

The term agent is one of wide signification.

* * * The purpose intended by section 2022, *supra*, would seem to be, to embrace all other persons who voluntarily assume to another a relation of trust and confidence.
* * *

In *Clement v. Canfield* (1856), 28 Vermont, 302, the court, through Redfield, C. J., held a lessee of a railroad an agent of the railroad corporation, within the meaning of the general railroad Act making the corporation and its agents liable for damages occasioned by want of fences and cattle guards:

(P. 304:) The word agent is a very extensive term, and may be fairly applied to almost anyone who performs the office of

another. This lessee, in one sense, certainly is the agent of the company. He is performing their functions, and clothed with their prerogatives, or he could not be allowed to take tolls, or freight and fare upon the road, or to run engines where he does, probably. In this sense he is the agent of the company. And, having, as such agent, acquired the powers and prerogatives of the company, is it anything unreasonable that he should, while exercising such powers and prerogatives, be subjected to the same liabilities which the law imposes upon the company and their agents who destroy property? But it is said that a lessee is not of the class of agents referred to in the statute. That the statute probably refers primarily to those agents of the company who are under their control, like engineers and conductors. But does not the very relation in which the term agent is used in this statute show that the legislature must have adopted that most extensive term for the very purpose of reaching any and all persons who might acquire the right to run the road, under the powers conferred upon the corporation? Any other construction would seem to be contrary to the fair use of the term agent, with reference to the subject matter.

The Government contends that the word "agent" in the first line of Revised Statutes, Section 5209, should, in order to effectuate the full purpose of the Act, be given as reasonable a construction as this Court gave to the word "agent" in the twelfth line of

the same section, in *United States v. Corbett* (1909), 215 U. S. 233. In that case, the question was whether the Comptroller of the Currency, who was given the power to appoint agents to examine the affairs of national banks, was himself an "agent" within the meaning of that part of the section which penalizes false entries "with intent * * * to deceive * * * any agent appointed to examine the affairs of any such association." This Court said, per White, J., that to hold otherwise

(P. 241:) would do violence to the text of section 5209 and conflict with its context, and would, besides, frustrate the plain purpose which the section, as a whole, was intended to accomplish, especially if it be considered in the light of cognate provisions of the statute. * * * Indeed, the words "any agent" would seem to have been used in the broadest sense for the express purpose of excluding the possibility of the contention now made.

(P. 242:) The rule of strict construction does not require that the narrowest technical meaning be given to the words employed in a criminal statute in disregard of their context and in frustration of the obvious legislative intent.

As Judge Brown said in *United States v. Jewett* (1897), 84 Fed. 143 (aff. in *Jewett v. United States* (1900), C. C. A., 1st Circ., 100 Fed. 832):

The protection afforded by the statute against embezzlement, abstraction, or willful misapplica-

tion of the property of the association should be held, in the absence of reasons to the contrary, to continue as long as the necessity for such protection exists. [Italics ours.]

When Congress punished by the National-Bank Act embezzlement committed by a bank clerk—an employee who presumably has a very limited control over or connection with bank property, with very limited opportunities to embezzle—is it likely that Congress intended to omit punishing by the same act a receiver who has full charge of the whole property of the bank, with almost unlimited opportunity for embezzlement?

As pointed out in this brief *infra*, unless an embezzling receiver can be prosecuted under this Section 5209, there is no other Federal statute under which he can be indicted unless Section 97 of the Criminal Code is applicable to receivers (which seems more than doubtful, see *infra*, p. 29-33). But the penalty contained in Section 97 is only fine or imprisonment, or both, with no minimum penalty provided for, so that the lower court's decision will have this result: That a national-bank clerk may be indicted under a statute which affixes a minimum penalty of five years' imprisonment, whereas a national-bank receiver may be indicted in a Federal court (if at all) only under a statute which contains no minimum penalty and makes it possible for him to escape with a simple fine (Federal Criminal Code, Sec. 97).

The Government contends that it is the clear duty of this Court to so construe Section 5209 as to avoid any such unjust and ridiculous result.

As it is abhorrent to our system of jurisprudence that there should be a wrong without a corresponding remedy, so is it abhorrent to our conception of the principles of natural justice that the receiver of a national bank who possesses unrestrained control over its assets should stand immune from adequate punishment for violation of his trust, and should not be held to the same strict accountability as a bank officer or a clerk.

Congress could not have intended to leave so large a hole in the National Bank Act out of which dishonest and defaulting receivers could creep.

III.

A national bank receiver is not an officer of any court and has not the status of a judicial receiver. He is simply a liquidating agent provided for the bank by the statute. In accepting its charter, the bank accepts all the provisions of the National Bank Act, including the provision for appointment of such a liquidating agent or receiver; and when such a receiver is appointed as such an agent by the Comptroller, his appointment is impliedly authorized by the bank.

The lower court says in its decision (R. 34) that the receiver

does not come within it because he is not appointed by the banking association, but by the comptroller. The word "agent" itself implies that he is appointed by the association. No one can be said to be the agent of another unless he has been chosen expressly or impliedly to act for him and on his behalf.

It is undoubtedly true, as a general rule, that an agency implies some act of choice or consent by the principal. An agent, however, may be constituted either by express act, or by implication, or by ratification, or by acceptance of statutory conditions, or by operation of law (Mechem on Agency, 2d Ed., 1914, Sec. 26).

A corporation for certain purposes may be conclusively deemed to assent to the appointment by statute of an agent to accept service. *Old Wayne Life Association v. McDonough* (1907), 204 U. S. 8, 21, 22; *Simon v. Southern Railway* (1915), 236 U. S. 115, 130; *Pennsylvania Fire Insurance Co. of Philadelphia v. Gold Issue Mining & Milling Co.* (1917), 243 U. S. 93, 96.

There can be little doubt of the power of Congress to enact a valid law making the Comptroller of the Currency, or a designated national-bank examiner, or a duly appointed receiver the agent of any national bank for prescribed purposes within the general purview of the banking laws. And this is precisely what Congress has, in effect, done in providing for the appointment of a receiver to take charge of the affairs of a national bank in the event of its declared insolvency or of its violation of specified provisions of the banking laws.

It is well-established law that the charter of a corporation does not consist of the articles of the association alone, but of such articles taken in connection with the provisions of law contained in the special or general statute under which the organi-

zation is formed; and the corporation accepts all such provisions as part of its charter, which it may not question. See *Chicago R. I. & Pac. Ry. Co. v. Zerneck* (1902), 183 U. S. 582, 588; *Newburyport Water Co. v. Newburyport* (1904), 193 U. S. 561, 579; *Interstate Consolidated Street Ry. Co. v. Massachusetts* (1907), 207 U. S. 79, 84; *Alabama & V. Ry. Co. v. Odeneal* (1895), 93 Miss. 34; *Swedish-American Telephone Co. v. Fidelity & Casualty Co.* (1904), 208 Ill. 562; 70 N. E. 768.

Each national bank, therefore, in accepting its charter impliedly consents to the appointment of such an agent to act for it upon the happening of any of the stipulated contingencies, and it accordingly assents to the authorized acts of such receiver when duly appointed.

It is contended that because the person appointed by a court technically known to the common law as a "receiver" is an officer of the court and holds the property in *custodia legis*, therefore the "receiver" appointed under the National Bank Act has the same legal status, and is governed by the doctrines laid down by the courts relative to judicial receivers.

But the Government contends that the doctrines relative to judicial receivers are not in any way pertinent, and that the text books and cases which state broadly that a judicial receiver is not the agent of the corporation (see *Metz v. Buffalo, etc., R. R.* (1874), 58 N. Y. 61, 66; *State v. Hubbard* (1897), 58 Kansas, 797, 801), do not apply in any way to this statutory bank receiver.

The term "receiver," technically, as defined by all the leading textbooks, means a person appointed by a court (see High on Receivers, 4th Ed., 1910, sec. 1; Cyc. vol. 34, pp. 15-16; Amer. & Eng. Ency'l of Law, 2d Ed., vol. 23, p. 1060); and it should strictly and properly not be used to signify any one else. Unfortunately, the National Bank Act adopted this word which had acquired a technical, legal meaning, and used this word "receiver" simply in the sense of a person appointed by the Comptroller to act for the bank. If the statute, instead of saying in Section 5234, "The Comptroller of the Currency may forthwith appoint a receiver," had said that he might appoint "an agent," or a "superintendent," or a "liquidator," the attempt to apply to such an appointee judicial decisions which referred solely to court receivers would never have been made.

In New York, the banking law provides for the liquidation of bank affairs through the Superintendent of Banks, who may appoint special deputy superintendents to assist him in the duty of liquidation and distribution. In *Union Bank of Brooklyn v. Kanturk Realty Corporation* (1911), 72 N. Y. Misc. 96, 97, the court said:

As he has the power to collect moneys, he also has the power to defend against counterclaims set up in suits for the collection of such moneys; and, if a verified counterclaim requires a verified reply, it necessarily follows that *the Legislature created the Superintendent or his deputy an agent of the corporation for this*

necessary step in the collection of the assets.
[Italics ours.]

A distinction between a "chancery, or, as it is sometimes called, a common receiver," and a statutory receiver is taken in *Stokes v. Hoffman House* (1901), 157 N. Y. 554, 559; and referred to in *Quincy, Missouri, & Pacific R. R. Co. v. Humphreys* (1892), 145 U. S. 82, 97.

IV.

The functions and duties of a receiver are substantially the same as those of liquidating agent of the bank provided for impliedly under Revised Statutes, Section 5220, and expressly under Section 3 of the Act of June 30, 1876. Such a liquidating agent and a receiver, both represent the bank in its corporate capacity, and act for its benefit. A liquidating agent has been held by the courts to be indictable under Revised Statutes, Section 5209.

In the original National Bank Act—Act of February 25, 1863, c. 58 (12 Stat. 665), there was no express provision made for a voluntary dissolution of a national bank. Voluntary dissolution was first provided for in the Act of June 3, 1864, c. 106, Section 42 (13 Stat. 99, 112), now embodied in Revised Statutes, Section 5220, which provides that "Any association may go into liquidation and be closed by the vote of its shareholders owning two-thirds of its stock." No express statutory provision was thereby made (or anywhere else in the Revised Statutes) for a liquidating agent, but the power of the bank to employ such an agent was implied, see

Jewett v. United States (C. C. A., 1st Circ., Mar. 29, 1900), 100 Fed. 832, 838, *et seq.*, and cases cited.

In the *Jewett* case, it was held that a liquidating agent who was appointed in voluntary dissolution under Revised Statutes, Section 5220 (and not appointed under Sec. 3 of the Act of June 30, 1876, c. 156, 19 Stat. 63, referred to *infra*), was an "agent" within the meaning of Revised Statutes, section 5209 (the criminal section at issue in the case at bar).

The next point made by Jewett is that Section 5209 of the Revised Statutes has no application to a bank in liquidation, or to an agent appointed to close its affairs. Clearly, both are within the letter of the statute, and within the mischief it was intended to remedy. Indeed, there would seem to be more ground for holding the terrors of the law over an agent who is in uncontrolled possession of the assets of an association, than over an officer who is at all times subject to the scrutiny of those who are about him or over him.

Later statutes, moreover, provide expressly for another liquidating agent, i. e., an agent to be appointed by the shareholders to take over the bank's affairs after the receiver has ended his duties. See Act of June 30, 1876, c. 156, Sec. 3 (19 Stat. 63), as amended by the Act of August 3, 1892, c. 360 (27 Stat. 345), and the Act of March 2, 1897, c. 354 (29 Stat. 600), quoted in full in Appendix A (pp. 41-45 of this brief).

In *McConville v. Gilmour, et al.* (1888), 36 Fed. 277, the status of such a liquidating agent was considered, the question being whether the Federal courts had jurisdiction of suits brought by such an agent (without regard to diversity of citizenship or the amount involved). The courts had already held that for the purposes of Federal jurisdiction a national-bank receiver was such an officer of the United States as could maintain a suit in a district court of the United States under the jurisdictional statutes. In the *McConville* case, the court decided that the liquidating agent was equally entitled to sue in a Federal court, and said (pp. 278, 279):

Indeed, the "agent" is only the "receiver" under another name. * * * *Each of these administrative officials—the "receiver" and the "agent"—represent the bank in its corporate capacity, and neither of them is more or less than the other such a representative.* * * * Indeed, here there is scarcely any necessity for a substitution, except for the bare purpose of technical conformity, since the "receiver" and the "agent" are one and the same person, and either may, under the privileges of the statute, sue in his own name as "receiver" or "agent." [Italics ours.]

The same view of the status of a liquidating agent was taken in *Guarantee Co. of North Dakota v. Hanway* (C. C. A., 8th Circ., 1900), 104 Fed. 369, 372, in which the court, after noting that a receiver was, for jurisdictional purposes, an officer of the United States, said that a liquidating agent was also an offi-

cer of the United States in the same sense and for the same purposes:

Now, a receiver is not an officer of the United States because the Nation has any pecuniary or other interest in his acts or omissions, but simply because an act of Congress authorizes his appointment, prescribes his duties, and designates the appointing power. By the same mark, a shareholder's agent is an agent and officer of the United States. The same act creates his office, authorizes his appointment, designates the appointing power, and imposes upon him the same duties. While at a certain stage in the proceedings for winding up the affairs of a national bank the power designated to appoint the agent may exercise its option to continue the receiver or to choose the agent, when that option has been exercised, and the agent has been appointed, he discharges the same duties as the receiver, and becomes the "agent and officer of the United States," in every sense in which the receiver is such an agent and officer.

In other words, the courts appear to hold that the functions of a liquidating agent and of a receiver are practically identical, and that if the receiver may sue in a Federal court, a liquidating agent may likewise so sue.

Let us consider the effect of Judge Cochran's decision in the case at bar upon a case like the *McConville case*. The plaintiff, McConville, was duly appointed as a receiver of an insolvent bank; the shareholders later appointed him as liquidating agent

under the provisions of the Act of June 30, 1876; McConville made application to have himself substituted as liquidating agent for the bank, in an action which he had commenced as receiver for the bank; and the court said: "Indeed, the 'agent' is only the 'receiver' under another name;" and held that the Federal court had jurisdiction of his suit. Now, here was the same individual, McConville. At one moment he was acting as receiver of a national bank, appointed by the Comptroller, and, according to Judge Cochran, could not be indicted under Revised Statutes, Section 5209; the next moment he became a "liquidating agent" appointed by the shareholders, and thereupon he became indictable under that section as an "agent." (See *Jewett v. United States* (C. C. A. 1900), 100 Fed. 832, *supra*.) Yet he had been judicially held to have substantially the same powers and duties as agent as he had when receiver; and his acts of embezzlement would have had as serious effects upon the bank in his first capacity as in his second.

Is it possible that Congress ever purposed, or that this Court is obliged to construe the word "agent" so as to bring about, such an illogical, unnecessary, and injurious result?

Suppose, in the above case, McConville embezzled \$10,000 of the bank's money in his capacity as receiver, on March 6, 1888, and \$10,000 more in his capacity as liquidating agent on March 7, 1888. For the latter crime, he would be subject to the penalty of a minimum term of imprisonment of five years

and a maximum term of 10 years (under Revised Statutes, Sec. 5209); but for the embezzlement as receiver he would, by Judge Cochran's decision in the lower court, either not be subject to any penalty at all under the Federal criminal laws, or else he might escape with a mere fine of \$10,000 and no imprisonment at all, such being the possible penalty provided for in Section 97 of the Federal Criminal Code (if that section can and shall be held to apply, which is doubtful; see *infra*, p. 29-33). Section 97, in full, is as follows:

Any officer connected with, or employed in, the Internal Revenue Service of the United States, and any assistant of such officer, who shall embezzle or wrongfully convert to his own use any money or other property of the United States, and any officer of the United States, or any assistant of such officer, who shall embezzle or wrongfully convert to his own use any money or property which may have come into his possession or under his control in the execution of such office or employment, or under color or claim of authority as such officer or assistant, whether the same shall be the money or property of the United States or of some other person or party, shall, where the offense is not otherwise punishable by some statute of the United States, be fined not more than the value of the money and property thus embezzled or converted, or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

This section was first enacted as the Act of February 3, 1879, c. 42 (20 Stat. 280)—16 years after

the first National Bank Act. It was clearly not intended to be the measure of punishment to be meted out to those who commit so serious a Federal crime as embezzlement of bank moneys by a receiver of a national bank; for the penalty was only a fine of not more than the value of the money or property embezzled *or* imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both, there being a minimum penalty of three months (whereas the National Bank Act provides a minimum penalty of five years, and makes no provision for a fine). By the revision in the Criminal Code, Section 97, even the three months' minimum penalty is eliminated.

V.

A national-bank receiver is not an officer of the United States within the purview of Federal criminal statutes punishing crimes committed by such officers.

(1) A decision that a receiver is an officer of the United States within the purview of the Federal criminal laws will be attended by the following extraordinary results:

First. That from the year 1863 to the year 1879, an embezzling receiver of a national bank could not have been prosecuted under any Federal criminal statute; for it was not until the latter year that, by the Act of February 3, 1879, c. 42 (20 Stat. 280; now Section 97 of the Federal Criminal Code), it was first made a crime for an officer of the United States to embezzle any money or property which came into his possession or under

his control in the execution of his office. Prior to this Act of 1879, the only Federal embezzlement statutes as to public officers were the Act of August 6, 1846 (9 Stat. 59), and the Act of June 15, 1866, c. 123 (14 Stat. 65), and Revised Statutes, Section 5496, which only referred to embezzlement of "the public monies of the United States," which term does not include the corporate funds of national banks.

Second. That from the year 1876 to the year 1879, a liquidating agent of a national bank appointed under the Act of June 30, 1876, c. 156, Section 3 (19 Stat. 63), apparently could not have been prosecuted for embezzlement under any Federal criminal statute; for *Guarantee Company of North Dakota v. Hanway* (C. C. A. 8th Circ., Oct. 9, 1900), 104 Fed. 369, 372, held that such a liquidating agent is an officer of the United States "in every sense in which the receiver is such an agent and officer." If, therefore, both agent and receiver were officers of the United States, as that term is used in criminal statutes, then it was not until the passage of the Act of February 3, 1879, c. 42 (20 Stat. 280), *supra*, that they could either of them have been criminally liable under Federal law.

(2) Neither the manner of appointment, method of payment of salary, nor duration or tenure of office are such as to constitute a national-bank receiver an officer of the United States. His appointment is by the Comptroller of the Currency, and is not required to be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury

(Rev. Stat., Sec. 5234); he is paid out of the assets of the bank before distribution of the proceeds (Rev. Stat., Sec. 5238); and he is appointed for no definite time, and for no fixed statutory salary.

Such a receiver clearly does not come within the purview of the term "officer of the United States" as that term is construed in criminal statutes in *United States v. Hartwell* (1867), 6 Wall. 385; *United States v. Germaine* (1878), 99 U. S. 508, 510; *United States v. Mouat* (1888), 124 U. S. 303, 307; *United States v. Smith* (1888), 124 U. S. 525, 533; *Martin v. United States* (C. C. A., 8th Circ., 1909), 168 Fed. 198; *Scully v. United States* (1910), 193 Fed. 185; *United States v. Van Wert* (1912), 195 Fed. 974. For this reason, therefore, Judge Shiras, in the Circuit Court for the District of Nebraska, in *Thompson v. Pool* (1895), 70 Fed. 725, 727, 728, stated that if he were not controlled by a prior decision in the circuit, he should hold that a receiver was not an officer of the United States, even in a civil case, within the meaning of the jurisdictional statutes:

I must say that, in view of the ruling of the Supreme Court in *U. S. v. Germaine*, 99 U. S. 508, and *U. S. v. Mouat*, 124 U. S. 303, 8 Sup. Ct. 505, it would seem clear that the holding in *Price v. Abbott* is based upon an untenable assumption, to wit, that an appointment of a receiver made by the comptroller can be deemed to be made with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and therefore the

receiver can be held to be an appointee of the Secretary, and therefore an officer of the United States, because appointed by the head of the department; it having been settled in *U. S. v. Germaine*, *supra*, that no one, although acting for the United States as its agent, can be deemed to be an officer thereof unless he holds his position by virtue of an appointment by the President, or by the head of a department, or by a court of law. The decisions in *Price v. Abbott*, at circuit, and in *U. S. v. Mouat*, seem to be in direct conflict, and if I deemed the question open for me for decision on its merits, I should be compelled to hold that, under the ruling in the cases cited, of *U. S. v. Germaine* and *U. S. v. Mouat*, a receiver is not an officer of the United States within the meaning of section 629 of the Revised Statutes, because he is an appointee of the comptroller, who is not the head of a department, and there is no statute which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to appoint a receiver, or to approve the appointment when made by the comptroller, and therefore a receiver can not be held to be an appointee of the head of the Treasury Department.

While the decision of Mr. Justice Gray in *Price, Receiver, v. Abbott* (1883), 17 Fed. 506, has been frequently cited in civil cases involving jurisdiction, it is doubtful if his reasoning would stand the test of the Supreme Court decisions in a criminal case involving the question whether a receiver is a constitutional officer of the United States.

If, therefore, it shall be held that a receiver is not such an officer within the purview of the criminal statutes, then there is now no law on the Federal statute books which will punish an embezzling bank receiver, unless he can be punished under the statute now in question, Revised Statutes, Section 5209; and if, on the other hand, it shall now be held that a receiver *is* such an officer, then from 1863 to 1879, there was no law on the Federal statute books under which he could have been punished for embezzlement.

VI.

The fact that for the limited purpose of suing in the Federal courts a national-bank receiver has been held to be an officer of the United States, as that term is used in statutes granting jurisdiction to Federal courts, is not incompatible with the status of the receiver as an agent of the bank. To this extent, he acts in a dual capacity.

Contention has been made that a national bank receiver can not, in law, be held to be an agent of the bank, because such receivers have been held for the mere purpose of jurisdiction of the Federal courts to be officers of the United States, as that term is used in certain jurisdictional statutes. But those making this contention overlook the fact that the very courts which so hold a receiver to be, for such limited purpose, an officer of the United States, also recognize the fact that he has in law a dual capacity, and that he represents the association, its stockholders and creditors as well. There seems to be nothing incompatible in these double functions.

Thus, in *Kennedy v. Gibson* (1869), 8 Wall. 498, while this Court said that (p. 504):

The receiver is the agent of the United States, and according to the 56th section of the act [Act of June 3, 1864, 13 Stat. 116], this suit should have been conducted by their attorney.

But it is to be noted that it further termed "the receiver the statutory assignee of the association. * * * He represents both the creditors and the association" (p. 506):

The claims of creditors may be proved before the comptroller, or established by suit against the association. Creditors must seek their remedy through the comptroller in the mode prescribed by the statute; they can not proceed directly in their own names against the stockholders or debtors of the bank. *The receiver is the statutory assignee of the association, and is the proper party to institute all suits; they may be brought both at law and in equity, in his name, or in the name of the association for his use. He represents both the creditors and the association, and when he sues in his own name it is not necessary to make either a party to the suit. [Italics ours.]*

And in *Price, Receiver, v. Abbott* (1883), 17 Fed. 506, Mr. Justice Gray, in the Circuit Court for the District of Massachusetts, well defined the dual capacity of such a receiver as follows (pp. 507-508):

The receiver, indeed, in one aspect represents the bank, its stockholders, and its

creditors; and neither he nor the comptroller of the currency represents the Government, so far as to have authority to waive its exemption from liability to suit. *Case v. Terrell*, 11 Wall. 199. But being appointed pursuant to an act of Congress to execute duties prescribed by that act, he is, in the execution of those duties, an agent and officer of the United States; and actions brought by him to recover assessments duly laid upon stockholders, and necessary to provide for the payment of the debts of the bank, are suits at common law brought by an officer of the United States suing under the authority of an act of Congress, of which this court has concurrent jurisdiction with the district court, without regard to the amount sued for.

It seems clear, however, that the decisions only go to the limited extent of holding a receiver to be an officer of the United States within the meaning of that term in certain special jurisdictional statutes. Thus, Revised Statutes, Section 563, cl. 4, gave the District Court jurisdiction in—

all suits at common law brought by the United States, *or by any officer thereof*, authorized by law to sue.

So, Revised Statutes, Section 629, cl. 3, gave the Circuit Court jurisdiction in—

all suits at common law where the United States, *or any officer thereof*, suing under the authority of an act of Congress, are plaintiff.

So, Revised Statutes, Section 380, require district attorneys to conduct—

all suits and proceedings arising out of the provisions of law governing national banking associations, in which the United States *or any of its officers or agents* shall be parties. * * *

In numerous cases arising under the above statutes, a receiver was held to be an officer of the United States within the purview of the particular statute. See *Gibson v. Peters* (1893), 150 U. S. 342; *In re Chetwood, petitioner* (1897), 165 U. S. 443; *Auten v. United States National Bank of New York* (1899), 174 U. S. 125; *Frelinghuysen v. Baldwin* (1882), 12 Fed. 395; *Hendee v. Connecticut & P. R. R. Co.* (1886), 26 Fed. 677; *Armstrong v. Trautman* (1888), 36 Fed. 275; *Stephens v. Bernays* (1890), 41 Fed. 401; *Thompson v. Pool et al.* (1895), 70 Fed. 725; *Speckart v. German National Bank et al.* (1898), 85 Fed. 12; *Murray v. Chambers* (1907), 151 Fed. 142.

There is nothing unusual, however, in one term having two distinct meanings in two different statutes (*Lamar v. United States* (1916), 240 U. S. 60, 65); and the best illustration of this fact is to be found in two consecutive cases in 124 U. S., in which in *United States v. Mouat*, page 303, a paymaster's clerk was held *not* to be an "officer of the Navy" within the meaning of the Act of June 30, 1876, c. 159 (19 Stat. 65), whereas in *United States v. Hendee*, page 309, a paymaster's clerk was held to be an "officer of the Navy" within the meaning of the Act of March 3, 1883, c. 97 (22 Stat. 473).

VII.

The opinion filed by the lower court contains no sufficient reasoning to establish the point decided. It holds that a receiver is a public officer and not an agent, but states the point as if it were axiomatic and needed no citation of authority or reason.

(1) The statement of the lower court to the effect that (R. 34)—

It is hardly conceivable that if Congress by section 5209 had intended to cover a receiver that it would not have named him expressly. It provided in the same legislation for the appointment of a receiver by the comptroller and also for the appointment of an agent by the shareholders of the association in a certain contingency. Such an agent comes within the description of section 5209 and a receiver does not,

is not strictly accurate, if it be interpreted to mean that Congress in the original bank Act, from which 5209 is taken, provided for any agent to be appointed by the shareholders to wind up the bank. As pointed out *supra*, there was no such provision for such agent in the original bank Act—Act of February 25, 1863, c. 58 (12 Stat. 665)—since there was no provision at all made in that Act for voluntary dissolution of a national bank. Voluntary dissolution was first provided for in the Act of June 3, 1864, c. 106, Section 42 (13 Stat. 99, 112), now embodied in Revised Statutes, Section 5220, and no express statutory provision was made for a liquidating agent, named as such, until the Act of June 30, 1876 (19 Stat. 63).

Hence, in the year 1863, when the original of Revised Statutes, Section 5209, was passed as Section 52 of the Act of February 25, 1863, the word "agent," as used in that section could hardly be said to refer only to an official of the bank who was not even named in the statute. The reasoning of the lower court is therefore plainly defective.

If the word "agent," as used in the original Act of 1863, only referred to those persons named as agents of the bank in that Act itself, the word must be given a very restricted scope; for the only agents specifically provided for in that Act are as follows:

SEC. 23 (yearly examination of bonds pledged). Such examination may be made by an *agent* of such association, duly appointed in writing for that purpose whose certificate before mentioned shall be of like force and validity as if executed by such president or cashier. [*Italics ours*].

SEC. 32 (worn out, mutilated, and canceled notes to be burned in presence of 3 persons appointed by Secretary of Treasury, Comptroller, and Treasurer): * * * and in case such notes shall have been delivered to the Comptroller by an officer or *agent* of such association, then in the presence, also, of such officer or agent. * * * [*Italics ours*]

(2) Nor is the remark of the lower court that the case is one for the application of the maxim "*noscitur a sociis*" valid. It is clear that the statute refers to three different classes of persons—first, officers, (i. e., president, director, cashier, teller); second, clerks; and lastly, agents.

There is no logical reason why the word "agent" should be restricted in its meaning, but rather the whole intent and tenor of the Act would seem to show that Congress meant to penalize acts of embezzlement, and other criminal activities, in connection with the bank's assets when committed by anyone acting in behalf of the bank, whether by an agent constituted by express vote of the bank's stockholders or officers, or by an agent constituted by operation of law.

(3) The lower court says:

It will be noted that the section does not cover every person who is entrusted with the funds and assets of a national banking association.

But this allegation is merely a restatement of the question which was before the court for decision.

(4) The court then proceeds to state that the section covers—

six different classes of persons sustaining a certain relation to the association and who, by virtue of such relation, may have custody and possession thereof (viz, of the funds and assets).

This, also, is merely reiterated statement, with no supporting reasons given. Moreover, not six classes of persons are included, but only three—officers, clerks, agents.

The court then says:

Unless, then, a receiver so appointed comes within these classes he is not covered by the section.

This, of course, is the question at issue. The Government claims that a receiver comes within the last class, viz, agent.

CONCLUSION.

It is respectfully submitted that the demurrers to the indictments were erroneously sustained and the judgment below should be reversed and the defendant ordered to stand for trial.

CHARLES WARREN,
Assistant Attorney General.

MARCH, 1918.

APPENDIX A.

Act of June 30, 1876, c. 156, sec. 3 (19 Stat. 63), as amended by the Act of August 3, 1892, c. 360 (27 Stat. 345), and the Act of March 2, 1897, c. 354 (29 Stat. 600).

SEC. 3. That whenever any association shall have been or shall be placed in the hands of a receiver, as provided in section fifty-two hundred and thirty-four and other sections of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and when, as provided in section fifty-two hundred and thirty-six thereof, the Comptroller of the Currency shall have paid to each and every creditor of such association, not including shareholders who are creditors of such association, whose claim or claims as such creditor shall have been proved or allowed as therein prescribed, the full amount of such claims, and all expenses of the receivership and the redemption of the circulating notes of such association shall have been provided for by depositing lawful money of the United States with the Treasurer of the United States, the Comptroller of the Currency shall call a meeting of the shareholders of such association by giving notice thereof for thirty days in a newspaper published in the town, city, or county where the business of such association was carried on, or if no newspaper is there published, in the newspaper published nearest thereto. At such meeting the share-

holders shall determine whether the receiver shall be continued and shall wind up the affairs of such association, or whether an agent shall be elected for that purpose, and in so determining the said shareholders shall vote by ballot, in person or by proxy, each share of stock entitling the holder to one vote, and the majority of the stock in value and number of shares shall be necessary to determine whether the said receiver shall be continued, or whether an agent shall be elected. In case such majority shall determine that the said receiver shall be continued, the said receiver shall thereupon proceed with the execution of his trust, and shall sell, dispose of, or otherwise collect the assets of the said association, and shall possess all the powers and authority, and be subject to all the duties and liabilities originally conferred or imposed upon him by his appointment as such receiver, so far as the same remain applicable. In case the said meeting shall, by the vote of a majority of the stock in value and number of shares, determine that an agent shall be elected, the said meeting shall thereupon proceed to elect an agent, voting by ballot, in person or by proxy, each share of stock entitling the holder to one vote, and the person who shall receive votes representing at least a majority of stock in value and number shall be declared the agent for the purposes hereinafter provided; and whenever any of the shareholders of the association shall, after the election of such agent, have executed and filed a bond to the satisfaction of the Comptroller

of the Currency, conditioned for the payment and discharge in full of each and every claim that may thereafter be proved and allowed by and before a competent court, and for the faithful performance of all and singular the duties of such trust, the Comptroller and the receiver shall thereupon transfer and deliver to such agent all the undivided or uncollected or other assets of such association then remaining in the hands or subject to the order and control of said Comptroller and said receiver, or either of them; and for this purpose said Comptroller and said receiver are hereby severally empowered and directed to execute any deed, assignment, transfer, or other instrument in writing that may be necessary and proper; and upon the execution and delivery of such instrument to the said agent the said Comptroller and the said receiver shall by virtue of this Act be discharged from any and all liabilities to such association and to each and all the creditors and shareholders thereof. Upon receiving such deed, assignment, transfer, or other instrument the person elected such agent shall hold, control, and dispose of the assets and property of such association which he may receive under the terms hereof for the benefit of the shareholders of such association, and he may in his own name, or in the name of such association, sue and be sued and do all other lawful acts and things necessary to finally settle and distribute the assets and property in his hands, and may sell, compromise, or compound the debts due to such

association, with the consent and approval of the circuit or district court of the United States for the district where the business of such association was carried on, and shall at the conclusion of his trust render to such district or circuit court a full account of all his proceedings, receipts, and expenditures as such agent, which court shall, upon due notice, settle and adjust such accounts and discharge said agent and the sureties upon said bond. And in case any such agent so elected shall refuse to serve, or die, resign, or be removed, any shareholder may call a meeting of the shareholders of such association in the town, city, or village where the business of the said association was carried on, by giving notice thereof for thirty days in a newspaper published in said town, city, or village, or if no newspaper is there published, in the newspaper published nearest thereto, at which meeting the shareholders shall elect an agent, voting by ballot, in person or by proxy, each share of stock entitling the holder to one vote, and when such agent shall have received votes representing at least a majority of the stock in value and number of shares, and shall have executed a bond to the shareholders conditioned for the faithful performance of his duties, in the penalty fixed by the shareholders at said meeting, with two sureties, to be approved by a judge of a court of record, and file said bond in the office of the clerk of a court of record in the county where the business of said association was carried on, he shall have all the rights, powers, and

duties of the agent first elected as hereinbefore provided. At any meeting held as hereinbefore provided administrators or executors of deceased shareholders may act and sign as the decedent might have done if living, and guardians of minors and trustees of other persons may so act and sign for their ward or wards or cestui que trust. The proceeds of the assets or property of any such association which may be undistributed at the time of such meeting or may be subsequently received shall be distributed as follows:

"First. To pay the expenses of the execution of the trust to the date of such payment.

"Second. To repay any amount or amounts which have been paid in by any shareholder or shareholders of such association upon and by reason of any and all assessments made upon the stock of such association by the order of the Comptroller of the Currency in accordance with the provisions of the statutes of the United States; and

"Third. The balance ratably among such stockholders, in proportion to the number of shares held and owned by each. Such distribution shall be made from time to time as the proceeds shall be received and as shall be deemed advisable by the said Comptroller or said agent."

○